

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, due to claim 3 depending on itself. Claim 3 has been amended without narrowing to depend from claim 1. Claims 3-5 were indicated as allowable if amended to correct the claim 3 dependency.

Claims 13, 20, and 22-24 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mochizuki, et al. (JP 2002360556 A and 2001070301 A and abstracts) alone or further in view of Mochizuki, et al. (U.S. 5,152,294). Claims 1, 6-10, 12, and 14-19 were allowed. Claim 20 was objected to as allowable if amended into independent form. It is believed the Examiner intended to object to claim 21, not 20, since claim 20 is independent and no rejection was provided for dependent claim 21.

Independent claim 13 recites that a forward direction velocity of the array is different than a reverse direction velocity for the first position and recites aligning a forward direction scan plane relative to a reverse direction scan plane as a function of the forward and reverse velocities. The Examiner relies on the U.S. '294 patent for the mechanisms, and relies on the JP references for the desired operation of the mechanisms.

The Examiner cites to Fig. 2 of the JP '556 to show difference in driving speed. However, there is no indication that the speed is different at a same location depending on the direction of movement. Fig. 2 shows only one direction of movement, not both. Figures 3-5 also only show one direction of movement. The abstract and the figures of JP '556 do not indicate that Mochizuki, et al. appreciated a difference in velocity at a same location depending on the direction of travel. In positioning the planes (see Figs. 3 and 5 of JP '556), the change in speed along one direction of movement is accounted for by centering the scan of each plane. There is no suggestion that the centering is different for the different direction of scanning. The symmetrical profile of Fig. 2 seems to indicate an assumption that the acceleration and breaking result in the same velocity for a given position.

JP '301 deals with a direction of scanning lines within a given plane. For the one direction (e.g., forward), the lines in a plane are scanned left-to-right, and for another direction (e.g., backward), the lines in a plane are scanned right-to-left (see Figs. 3 and 4 of JP '301). There is no indication that a forward direction velocity of the array is different than a reverse direction velocity for a given position.

Both the JP references fail to disclose an appreciation for different velocities for a given location due to the forward and backward scanning. JP '556 appears to indicate a same velocity due to the symmetry of the motion profile of Fig. 2. Accordingly, the JP references do not indicate aligning a forward direction scan plane relative to a reverse direction scan plane as a function of these different forward and reverse velocities. It would not have been obvious to do this based on the teachings of the JP references since the JP references do not even contemplate the difference in velocity depending on direction.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 21, so is allowable. Claims 22-24 are allowable for the same reason.


CONCLUSION:

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (650) 694-5330 or Craig Summerfield at (312) 321-4726.

PLEASE MAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Siemens Corporation
Customer No. 28524
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

Respectfully submitted,



Rosa S. Kim, Reg. No. 39,728

Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

Telephone: 650-694-5330

Date: 11-8-07